

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XII. *Third Series.*    APRIL, 1914.    No. 46

---

## THE FIRST FOLIO.

THE most carefully prepared and the most perfectly printed book ever produced by man is the First Folio of the Shakespeare plays published in 1623, and perhaps the thing most discreditable to the literary world is the mighty mass of manifest blunders, miscalled corrections, that is found in the "Variorum" and other editions of the plays.

In the address "To the Great Variety of Readers," which forms the preface, we are told that the plays "are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them. Who, as he was a happie imitator of Nature, was a most gentle expressor of it. His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he uttered with that easinesse, that wee have scarce received from him a blot in his papers."

These words tell us the true story of the manner in which the "Great Master," Bacon, arranged every column, and every word in every column, and every capital letter in every column, and every italic letter and word in every column, and every "printer's error" in every column, and every misprint in every column, to be exactly as and where we find them. He also arranged

in the most purposeful manner every mispagination throughout the volume.

Accordingly, the Folio is signed "hang'd hog" upon the first page by means of a "printer's error," and signed upon the last page by means of a mispagination. The last page is numbered 993 instead of 399, and 993 spells "Baconus."

In very numerous books of the period upon page 53 we find some reference to Bacon or Shakespeare. The First Folio, although bound in one volume, consists of three books—"The Comedies," "The Histories," and "The Tragedies"—each of which is separately paged. Upon the first page 53, that is in "The Comedies," we find an ignorant boy, William, who incorrectly gives "hinc" as the accusative case of "hic"; and a Welsh schoolmaster, Evans, is introduced for the purpose of pronouncing "c" as "g." This man does not correct the boy's blunder, because if he so did he would spoil the key-words; but he says, "I pray you remember (childe) accusativo hing hang hog." Then Mrs. Quickly cries out, "Hang-hog is latten for Bacon I warrant you."

To fully understand this revelation of Bacon's authorship on the first page 53 we must refer to Bacon's "Apophthegms," which were not published until 1671, and are numbered from 1 to 307. Now, to which of these must we look for the explanation?

There are thirty-six plays in the Folio, and this number is not accidental, but thirty-six is a cabalistic number. Bacon brought out his thirty-six plays in English in London in 1623 under the name of William Shakespeare, and he brought out in the same year (1623) thirty-six of his plays in French in Paris under the name of Alexandre Hardy. In the edition of his Essays in Italian, published in 1618, the thirty-sixth is "Delle Fattioni"; that is concerning stage plays; and



in his "De Augmentis," first published in English in 1641, the 36th of the Antitheta begins with the words "The stage." Therefore, in order to learn the meaning of "Hang-hog" on page 53 in the plays we must look to the 36th of Bacon's Apophthegms, and there we read :

"Sir *Nicholas Bacon*, being appointed a Judge for the Northern Circuit, and having brought his Trials that came before him to such a pass, as the passing of Sentence on Malefactors, he was by one of the Malefactors mightily importuned for to save his life, which when nothing that he had said did avail, he at length desired his mercy on account of kindred: Prethee, said my Lord Judge, how came that in? Why, if it please you my Lord, your name is *Bacon*, and mine is *Hog*, and in all Ages *Hog* and *Bacon* have been so near kindred, that they are not to be separated. I [Aye] but replied Judge *Bacon*, *you and I cannot be kindred, except you be hanged; for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged.*"

This gruesome story explains Dame Quickly's words upon the first page 53 of the Plays. Upon the next page 53, which is in the Histories, we read: "be hangd: come away." And the second carrier replies: "I have a Gammon of Bacon." This is only found on page 53 by means of mispagination, for pages 47 and 48 are purposely omitted.

Those acquainted with cyphers and emblems, especially with 'Masonic emblems, will not expect to find the third revelation upon the visible page 53 but upon the invisible page 53. Now, in any book the invisible page 53 is page 53 counting not from the beginning but from the end of the volume. The page that is 53 from the end in the Folio is page 347, and on this page 53 from the end we find as the 53rd word from the commencement of the new scene "Wilde-Boares." A "wild-

boar " is Bacon's crest. Mr. George Hookham wrote to me that this discovery gave him quite a shock, because since " Wilde-Boares " is found only this one time in the Folio in which there are about two million words, the chance against " Wilde-Boares " being found on the 53rd page from the end as the 53rd word from the commencement of a new scene is two millions against unity. In other words, it is absolutely certain that the Great Master " Bacon " must have purposefully arranged the pages and the columns and the words in the columns of the first Folio, so that we find his crest, a " Wilde-Boare," as the 53rd word from the commencement of a new scene on page 347, which is the 53rd page from the end of the volume.

An excellent example of the extremely careful manner in which the first Folio is printed will be found upon the first page 136. This page commences with the same words and is practically taken bodily, with a few important corrections, from F. 4 (the little book is not pagged) in the Quarto of *Loves Labour's lost*, which was published in 1598, and is the first play to which the name of William Shakespeare was attached. The whole page is a cypher revelation of Bacon's authorship. We must remember that the key number of the Shakespeare plays is No. 287. The plays commence with the lines " To the Reader," which tell us, in the clearest manner, that the so-called portrait of William Shakespeare is merely a dummy. If the letters of this skit are counted, the four V's, which are inserted instead of two W's, being counted, as they are intended to be, as four letters, we shall find that the total number of the letters is 287, which is a well-known 'Masonic number. It is not by accident but by extraordinary skill and care that the revelation found in F. 4 of the 1598 Quarto of *Love's Labours lost* has been placed on the first page 136 of the Folio. If we deduct 136 from 287 we get 151, and



we find—omitting words in italics—that Honorificabilitudinitatibus (the numerical value of the letters of which amount to 287) is the 151st word from the top of the page.

If anyone will read Chapter X. in my book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare," they will find that this long word placed where it appears in the Folio proves with absolute certainty that the plays are Bacon's children. But my present object is to show the extreme care exercised in preparing the first Folio. In the 1598 Quarto of *L.L.L.*, in consequence of a printer's error, the count is 150. This has been corrected in the Folio, so as to give the exact figure required, viz., 151. The lines have also been most carefully re-arranged, so that "What is A b speld backward with a horn on his head" appears as it should appear on line 33, because 33 spells Bacon

$\left\{ \begin{array}{ccccc} B & A & C & O & N \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 14 & 13 \end{array} \right. = 33$  } as we find in a number of

books and emblems.

In 1623 Bacon brought out his plays in London under Shakespeare's name, and in the following year, 1624, he brought out at Lunæburg, under the name of Gustavus Selenus (the man-in-the-moon), his great Cryptographic book which forms a key to many of the cyphers contained in the plays. Upon the title-page of this work, printed 1624, appears the only portrait of the real man William Shakespeare of Stratford, excepting that shown in Dugdale's engraving of the Stratford bust, which was not printed till 1656. I have placed upon the screen the 1624 face of the Spearman side by side with Dugdale's engraving of the bust (1656), both enlarged a hundred-fold, and no one can doubt that they represent the same person. Thus all the nonsense that has been written about the supposed incorrectness of Dugdale's representation is disposed of.

Now to return to page 136 of the first Folio of the plays. Commencing at line 33 we read :—

What is A b, speld backward with a horn on his head ?

*Peda.*—Ba *puericia* with a horne added.

*Pag.*— Ba most seely Sheepe, with a horne : you heare his learning.

*Peda.*—*Quis, quis*, thou consonant ?

*Pag.*— The last of the five Vowels if You repeat them, or the fift if I.

*Peda.*—I will repeat them : a e I [Mark that the I is a capital letter ; this is all important for the cypher].

*Pag.*— The Sheepe, the other two concludes it, o u.

The right answer as to what is A b speld backward with a horn on his head is, of course, B a, with the Latin word “cornu” added, “Bacorn you fool.” Then we have the query “*Quis, quis?*” Which Bacon? The answer to which is a e I o u, which spells F R A. We are thus told Fra Bacon. In order to know that a e I o u spells F R A we must turn to Bacon’s 1624 great Cryptographic book. To what page should we look? As I have shown, the key number of page 136 in the Folio of the plays is number 287. Our present story commences on line 33, so we must deduct that number from 287 and we get 254; and if we turn to page 254 in Bacon’s great Cryptographic book of 1624 we shall find that we can make all the letters of the alphabet by taking the vowels in pairs. Acting on the rules and the table there supplied we find that “a” followed by “e” makes the letter “F.” Then “I” being a capital letter does not follow “e” but starts afresh, and “I” followed by “o” makes the letter “R”; while “o” followed by “u” makes the letter “A,” and completes the F R A, which gives us Fra Bacon.

The hopelessly ignorant literati who so foolishly alter what they fail to understand in the first Folio have run riot over the wonderful page 136 in the Folio, which is

absolutely perfect in every line and in every letter. Indeed, I think nothing can surpass the crass stupidity of the senseless alteration of the clever stage joke, "the last of the five vowels if you repeat them, the fifth if I," which induces the gull to try and repeat the vowels, when he is pounced upon by the boy so soon as he has said "I." This joke they have destroyed by converting it into the plain prose statement, "The third of the five vowels, if you repeat them, the fifth if I," which is not only not a catch, but is so manifestly a snare that the veriest nincompoop would never have attempted to repeat the vowels, but would have said to the boy, "You malapert rascal; you mean me." Of course, the ignoramuses "correct" a e I. (which gives the cypher) into a e i. (which does not). They seem never capable of understanding that every capital letter and every seeming error in the first Folio has a meaning and that it is sacrilege to change a sign or a syllable. Every instance given in the January (1914) number of *BACONIANA* supplies an example of the marvellous correctness of the printing of the 1623 first Folio of the plays, and of the hopeless imbecility of the would-be correctors, who are altogether ignorant of the inner meaning of the plays.

EDWIN DURNING-LAWRENCE.



## THE FIRST FOLIO.

IT is impossible in the restricted pages of BACONIANA to attempt to cover the whole of the ground opened by Mr. G. B. Rosher's article on the alleged errors contained in the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays. The editors and commentators in the long array of quotations cited, by their unanimity appear to demonstrate beyond question that the work as issued from the press was set up from copy which was put together in a rough, crude and careless manner, and that its defects were intensified by what can only be described as culpable negligence on the part of the printers. The opinions quoted are said to be those "of men whose names collectively stand for a great deal in the way of Shakespearean study, knowledge and authority." It would ill become one, who has no authority to speak upon the subject, to criticise the work of the eminent men whose conclusions are given, and these observations are offered with all diffidence. But they are founded on a close acquaintance with the writings of most of the men quoted, a general knowledge of those of the remainder and of the whole field of literature which comes under the classification of "Shakespeareana."

The poems and plays of Shakespeare have never yet been edited by any man possessing the intelligence, the knowledge and other qualifications necessary for such a task. Admirable work has been done. Points have been raised and suggestions made which are of great value. It might almost be said that the blunders of these eminent men are instructive to the student. How curious it is to notice that the criticisms on Shakespeare's geographical allusions are ill-founded, and the result of ignorance on the part of those who made them! Shakespeare was right and his critics were



wrong, as Sir Edward Sullivan has conclusively proved.\* Dr. Samuel Johnson in his preface has justified the propriety of the use of anachronisms, and attributes them to design and not to ignorance. "Every page is so scandalously false spelled," wrote Pope. But there was no standard for spelling in the Elizabethan period. Every writer varied spelling at his pleasure and would frequently spell the same word in two or three different ways on the same page. The controversies which have raged around the interpretation of various passages, many of which deal with trivialities that are of no consequence, have been laboured to boredom; still all have tended to a better understanding of the poet's meaning.

The editors, commentators and critics have, however, approached the great masterpieces of literature from a wrong standpoint. They have, with few exceptions, assumed that they were the production of a man of genius who was ill-educated. There has been too much desire to "put Shakespeare right," and in attempting this there has appeared an obvious feeling on the part of the writers that they were criticising the work of one who was their inferior in culture and knowledge. These men have approached the subject much in the same way as a distinguished Royal Academician would regard the pictures of some young untrained artist of genius. True, there are exceptions. Lessing, Schlegel, and Gervinus all recognised the true position of the poet, as did S. T. Coleridge and others. Dr. C. M. Ingleby wrote in 1874, "We are at length slowly rounding to a just estimate of his works; and the time seems to be at hand when men of culture will attribute to the object of their admiration a much higher range of powers than

\* See *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1908. Article on "Shakespeare and the Waterways of North Italy," by Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart.

were requisite for the production of the most popular and successful dramas in the world."

No man is capable of adequately editing an edition of Shakespeare's poems and plays who has not a thorough knowledge of the books published in England and France between the years 1576 and 1630. If one may judge from the works published upon literature, no man has yet written who had this knowledge, or even had a knowledge of the books published in England. John Payne Collier's writings bear evidence that scores of important works of that period had not come under his observation. The ignorance of men of letters about the Elizabethan and early Jacobean literature is appalling. The bulk of the books published during the period in question are known only to some book collectors and some second-hand booksellers. How few of these have read the books, and how fewer still recognise their bearing upon what is termed the great English Renaissance in literature which had its culmination in the publication of the First Folio in 1623! The French literature of that period is, though of less, still of great importance, and a knowledge of it is essential to the ideal editor. The remarkable fact is that most, if not all, of these French works were translated into English and published in England at a time when there were so few to read or appreciate them that a heavy loss must have been entailed on someone by the production of each volume. The books of this period were well printed, and for the most part free from glaring errors. Richard Field, George Bishop, Adam Islip, George Eld, John Haviland, William Jaggard, and others produced volumes which were a credit to any printer. In 1623, the year in which the First Folio appeared, William Jaggard published "The Theatre of Honour and Knighthood, or a Compendious Chronicle and Historie of the whole Christian World, written by Andrew



Favine, Parisian." The name of the translator into English is not mentioned. The remarkable dedication to Sir Henrie Montague Knight, Lord Baron of Kimbalton, Viscount Mandeville, bears at its foot the initials W. I., presumably William Jaggard the printer. The book contains upwards of 1,100 pages—and is an example of excellency in the printer's art. It is profusely illustrated with woodcuts.

Jaggard deservedly had a great reputation as a printer. How is it possible that he should permit a book to be published bearing his name, and containing, if Professor G. L. Craik be right, upwards of 20,000 errors? The great printers have always taken a pride in the manner in which their work was turned out. It is related of John Froben, one of the greatest printers of all time, who employed on his staff of editors Erasmus, that when the proof-sheets were ready to go to press, he posted them up outside his office, and offered a prize to anyone who could detect an error in the letterpress. In 1623, John Haviland printed John Minsheu's Dictionary in Spanish and English, together with a Spanish Grammar, and a book of Pleasant and Delightful Dialogues in Spanish and English, containing in all 543 pages—another great example of the printer's art. This list might be extended to comprise scores of books. The printers were proud of their calling and emulated each other in the excellence of their works. What could Jaggard have been doing to permit the First Folio to be issued in the condition in which it has come down to us, unless it was intentionally so printed?

If the editors and commentators are right, the First Folio stands out as a literary curiosity—the worst printed book which was ever issued from the press. Here is a work acknowledged to be the very acme of all the literature of the world, the authorised version of

the Scriptures only excepted—a work which has caused the production of a literature bearing on it, not only in England, but in other countries, which is without a parallel—printed and published so that it has become a bye-word for all time. But that is not the only cause for amazement. The prevailing opinion is that it was published under the supervision of Ben Jonson, who was certainly a scholar, if not a pedant. He must have known the condition in which it was going through the press. What was he thinking about to permit his name to appear on such an outrage on all scholarship? The Grocer Heminge, and his friend might permit their names to be appended to the address to the Reader. They had no literary reputation which could suffer. But Ben Jonson? Impossible.

What, then, is the explanation? Are the critics once more in error, and was “William Shakespeare” by design publishing what he knew to be the greatest work of all time in cryptic form so that the wits of future ages might recognise his mind, although in a weed? Was it all part of the great delusion?

An attempt will now be made to deal only with two classes of the alleged 20,000 errors. How many of the total Professor Craik would apportion to these two classes it is difficult to determine, but if the punctuation and mispagination of the volume can be vindicated, a very substantial reduction in that total must be made.

In 1911 the Clarendon Press of Oxford published a little work entitled “Shakespearian Punctuation.” It is a book which should be upon the shelves of every student of Shakespeare. It is one of the ablest works which have appeared on the Shakespeare productions. The author is Mr. Percy Simpson, M.A., formerly scholar of Selwyn College, Cambridge. Mr. Simpson is now collaborating with Professor Herford in an edition of Ben Jonson’s works in nine volumes which will



undoubtedly become the standard edition. By permission the introduction to "Shakespearian Punctuation" is now reproduced. No further comments are here necessary, as it covers the ground so effectually that at any rate the alleged errors in punctuation in the First Folio must tentatively be withdrawn as open to argument.

This is Mr. Percy Simpson's "Introduction":—

"It is a common practice at the present day to treat the punctuation of seventeenth-century books as beneath serious notice; editors rarely allude to it, and if they do, they describe it as chaotic and warn the reader that they have been driven to abandon it. It seems to be imagined that the compositor peppered the pages promiscuously with any punctuation-marks that came to hand, and was lavish of commas because his stock of these was large. In other words, old printers—printers as a class—were grossly illiterate and careless; the utmost that could be expected of them was that they should spell out their texts correctly; nobody troubled about punctuation, not even the 'Corrector,' who is referred to occasionally, for praise or the reverse, by writers of the time."

"Doubtless an adroit compiler could get together an assortment of quartos so badly printed as almost to justify a theory so wild as this. But very little reflection should convince a reader of average intelligence that the idea is ludicrous. Has any scholar of standing ever made the attempt to substantiate such a charge by evidence? Is it on *a priori* grounds likely that printers were more ignorant than the majority of their fellow-men? Could a human being endowed with reason serve an apprenticeship, work at the trade of printing all his life, and set up the type of book after book, without fathoming the inscrutable mystery of the comma and the full stop? To come to close quarters with this

curious problem: we may concede that a careless or ignorant printer might leave out stops since the omission perhaps saved him trouble; but would he insert them gratuitously for the fun of the thing? Would he print the beautiful lines of Donne in this form—

For love, all love of other fights controules,  
And makes one little roome, an every where.—

as a sheer freak in typography? or is it possible to attach a significance to the commas? Is not the beauty of the rhythm heightened and the phrasing touched with deeper meaning if the voice rests for a moment after the words with the unusual pointing?"

"The fact is that English punctuation has radically changed in the last three hundred years. Modern punctuation is, or at any rate attempts to be, logical; the earlier system was mainly rhythmical. Apply this test to a few pages of the First Folio or the 1609 edition of the *Sonnets*, and it gives a clue to many of the apparent anomalies. Indeed, a lover of poetry, who prefers to read Shakespeare as he was printed and wishes for plain, practical directions in this matter of punctuation, cannot do better than take a work of moderate compass like the *Sonnets*, accessible in facsimile, and collate it with a standard edition of the present day till he has mastered the main points of difference. He will find even in these details a subject of poetic study, for the printer of the 1609 text was at great pains to indicate the rhythm by the punctuation. The *Sonnets* are frequently referred to in the following pages, but one passage of exceptional beauty must be cited as evidence here.

If it be not, then loue doth well denote,  
Loues eye is not fo true as all mens: no,  
How can it? O how can loues eye be true,  
That is fo vext with watching and with teares?

*Sonnet cxlvi. 7—10.*



Instead of adding any comment of my own, I prefer to summon an independent witness. Mr. George Wyndham has pointed out that in these lines 'there is revealed a piece of punctuation so exquisite as to affirm an author's hand.' He adds, with reference to the colon and pause in the eighth line, 'No journeyman-printer, no pirate-publisher, achieved that effect. It leads up, with the prescience of consummate art, to the rhythmical stress on the second "can" in line 9, and, in its own way, it is as subtle.' " " \*

"There is a second important difference between the old and the new systems. Modern punctuation is uniform; the old punctuation was quite the reverse. It was natural that in the earlier stages of printing usage should be less settled, and it was certainly convenient for the printer. For the poet it was something more: a flexible system of punctuation enabled him to express subtle differences of tone. A comparison of the two following passages is suggestive.

Shee is a woman, therefore may be woo'd,  
 Shee is a woman, therefore may be wonne,  
 She is *Lauinia* therefore must be lou'd.

*Titus Andronicus*, II, i. 82—4.

*Suf.* She's beautifull; and therefore to be Wooed;  
 She is a Woman; therefore to be Wonne.

*Henry the Sixth*, Part I. v. iii. 78—9.

The justification for either pointing is given below (pp. 18, 19 and §§ 26, 30); but there is here more than a superficial change. The poet's instinct—for this too was no haphazard variation of the printer—has used even these trivial details to indicate a spiritual difference. Suffolk, who has just captured Margaret of Anjou, falls passionately in love with her at once; he speaks in troubled asides, and he follows this very reflection with the thought that he has a wife already, and that

\* The "Poems of Shakespeare," p. 266.

Margaret is too great to be his paramour. In the end he wooes and wins her for the King. The checked and broken speech indicates the conflict in his mind. But in the other passage Demetrius, fired with lust and revenge, has schemed effectively to seize Lavinia, and the confident, unpausing note is in keeping with his character and situation."

"It would be easy to multiply instances of variety which admit of intelligible explanation, but with the principle once stated, it will be sufficient to take one or two typical cases. When Moonshine tries to make his first speech in the interlude of Pyramus and Thisbe, the words might run simply and directly as they would generally be pronounced,

My selfe the man i'th Moone doth seeme to be.

Or according to the common practice of marking off a phrase or group of words with an enclosing comma (§ 10), the words might be punctuated,

My selfe the man i'th Moone, doth seeme to be.

But the Folio actually prints

My selfe, the man i'th Moone doth feeme to be,

indicating the speaker's self-importance by an emphatic pause (§ 7)."

"An extreme case of variety occurs in punctuating an interrupted speech; the break may be marked by a comma (§ 9), or a semicolon (§ 28), or a colon (§ 32), or the modern dash, or a full stop (§ 36), or no stop at all (§ 41). We call our modern punctuation logical, but we can produce nothing to equal the uncompromising logic of a system which dispensed with stops when, from the nature of the sentence, the stops could not perform their function. The absence of stops is sometimes very suggestive. Pistoll's speech after he has taken his first timid bite of the leek (*Henry the Fifth*, v. i. 49—50), is thus printed in the Folio :



By this Leeke, I will moft horribly reuenge I eate and eate I fweare.

It is a pity to clog this disordered utterance with the puny restraint of commas. The words come wildly from the victim while he writhes and eats and roars, and Fluellen's cudgel supplies a very satisfactory punctuation for them."

"In such passages the modernizers sacrifice something of the life and force of the original, and for this the smoothness of a uniform system is scant compensation. But the text of Shakespeare is disfigured by actual blunders for which the principle of modernizing is not responsible. The opening line of *Sonnet lxxxiv.*, as Shakespeare wrote it and Eld printed it, is—

Who is it that sayes moft, which can say more,  
Then this rich praise, that you alone, are you, . . .

Here 'which' is a relative pronoun, but it has been frequently read as interrogative, and the line distorted to

Who is it that fays most? which can fay more . . .?"

"An equally bad instance occurs in *Macbeth* i. ii. 55—7, where the Folio reads—

Till that *Bellona's* Bridegroom, lapt in prooffe,  
Confronted him with felfe-comparifons,  
Point againft point, rebellious Arme 'gainft Arme, . . .

Most editors since Theobald have imagined that they improved the rhythm of this passage by printing

Point againft point rebellious, arm 'gainft arm.

By thus deserting the Folio, they have obliterated a characteristic feature of Shakespeare's style: when he points a double antithesis in this way, he avoids monotony and attains emphasis by putting an adjective with the second pair. For instance,

Turne face to face, and bloody point to point.  
*King Iohn*, ii. i. 390.

## The First Folio.

Then call them to our prefence face to face,  
And frowning brow to brow, . . .

*Richard the Second*, i. i. 15—16.

That Face to Face, and Royall Eye to Eye,  
You haue congreeted : . . .

*Henry the Fifth*, v. ii. 30—1.

Teare for teare, and louing kiffe for kiffe, . . .

*Titus Andronicus*, v. iii. 156.

The evidence here is overwhelming, but it is perfectly clear why editors have gone astray. They have been accustomed to treat the Folio as utterly devoid of value in anything that depends upon the printing. Instead of adopting a critical attitude and asking, 'Can this be kept? has it any meaning? are there parallels?' they merely follow the promptings of their fancy and in nine passages out of ten trifle with the text."

"In point of fact, then, the attempt here made to expound and classify the earlier methods of punctuation involves a larger and very important issue. If the current view is right that the First Folio was set up by careless printers, the gravest suspicion is cast upon the text itself. At a time when conjecture ran riot in it, no one could have had an inkling of the real nature of the problem. But that day is over, and the scope of textual criticism can now be accurately defined; the poet's words are no longer, we may hope, in danger of reckless alteration. Yet three minor points remain in which—to judge from recent evidence—the Folio is still liable to attack. These are spelling, the arrangement of the verse, and punctuation. Spelling may safely be left to look after itself, especially in view of the fact that phonetic spellings have been pilloried as misprints. The verse-arrangement is more likely to have confused a printer, especially in dialogue. Apart from a practice of the Folio to break up a blank verse line and print it, where possible, as two half lines—a practice which was

certainly intentional at times \*—there remain a number of passages in which the lines are incorrectly distributed. But the punctuation, which is usually regarded as the weakest point in the printing of the Folio, I believe to be on the whole sound and reasonable. It will help to a higher appreciation of the merits of this famous text if its claim to be regarded as correct in an elementary point of typography can be conclusively established. I have attempted to marshal the evidence, and I venture to submit the issue to the judgment of scholars. Was there, or was there not, a system of punctuation which old printers used? Can the differences of this system be classified, and proved step by step by an accumulation of instances? If so, we must do Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount and their workmen the justice to believe that they knew how to print."

Here ends the "Introduction" to Shakesperian Punctuation.

---

To explain in an article the reasons for stating that the mispaginations in the First Folio were intentional is difficult. It is true that mispaginations in the books of that period are not uncommon. As a rule, however, these are slight, and consist of an incorrect figure in the number of a page, the pages before and after being correctly paged. But in some books the numbers are so erratic and on such a large scale that it is impossible to conceive that they could pass unobserved by the printer or his reader. Clark and Glover are quoted by Mr. Roshier as stating in the preface of Vol. I. of the "Cambridge Shakespeare" that in those days it does not appear that there were any proof-sheets sent either to author or editor. They consider it certain that after a manuscript had been sent to press it was seen only by the

\* See pp. 69, 70.



printers and one or more correctors of the press regularly employed by the publishers for that purpose. This is only their opinion, and the grounds are not stated upon which it is formed. There is no evidence which the writer can find to justify this statement, but there is evidence as to the condition in which manuscripts were sent to the printer. Corrections by the printer when the copy was in type were more difficult then than they are to-day, and the manuscript was fair copied and revised before it came into the hands of the printers.

A notable example of this is a manuscript preserved in the British Museum of the translation attributed to Sir John Harrington of Ariosto's "*Orlando Furioso*," printed by Richard Field in 1591. The manuscript has been beautifully copied on 4to. paper and is marked off throughout, showing the stanzas which are to be printed on each page. The number of the page is given and the printer's signature for the foot of the page.\* At the end of the manuscript are certain directions to the printer as to type, &c. It appears clear that this is not the copy from which the printer set up his type. It is perfectly clean and unsoiled, and it is impossible to believe that the compositor could have used it and left it in such a condition. The probability is that this manuscript was again copied out, page by page, on separate sheets, and that these were handed to the compositor to use in setting up the type. The careful manner in which the manuscript was prepared for the printer is made evident from this example.

There is in existence the final revised manuscript of John Barclay's "*Argenis*," published in Paris in 1621.

\* All these instructions are undoubtedly in Francis Bacon's handwriting. There can be no doubt about this in the mind of anyone who is conversant with the peculiarities of his figures.

It is written in Latin in the author's handwriting. Every page abounds in corrections and alterations, prose in some cases crossed out and the text rendered into poetry substituted. In some places sheets of an earlier copy are incorporated. This is obvious from the pagination, which has not been altered, and the handwriting, which is different. That the corrections and alterations are the work of the author is self-evident. As corrected, it agrees in every word with the text of the volume published in 1621. The printer would have found it a difficult, if not impossible, task to set up the type from this copy. The clean and unsoiled condition makes it plain that this was not the manuscript which was used in the compositor's room. It would be re-copied probably after the style of the "Orlando Furioso" manuscript and no doubt marked in the same manner.

It is noteworthy that in an emblem book published in 1616, two of the illustrations depict the inside of a printer's workshop. In both of these a man wearing a hat of the well-known Bacon shape is standing beside the compositor, apparently giving him directions as to the setting of the type.

Probably the two volumes in the whole of literature containing the greatest eccentricities in pagination are "The Two\* books of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane," and the First Folio. The former was published by Henrie Tomes in 1605. In this each leaf, not page, is numbered. With the exception of the trifle which was published in 1597, containing ten short essays and the "Meditationes Sacræ," this was Bacon's first work. At the time of its publication he was 45

\* The word two on the title-page is spelt TVVOO. So far, the writer has been unable to find the word so spelt in any other book.

years of age and not by any means actively employed. It was addressed to the King, but was probably written many years before its publication, for many of the deficiencies pointed out in it had already been supplied. It would not be surprising to find that the book was written as early as 1580 and had formed the basis of that long suit to Elizabeth which was never granted. This, however, is by-the-way. Be this as it may, it might be expected that in the first book of any pretensions which Bacon published he would have been careful that it should issue from the press in a perfect condition. What are the facts as to its pagination? The 45 leaves of the first book are correctly numbered. In the second book there is no number on leaf 6. Leaf 9 is numbered 6, the correct figure apparently printed upside down; 30 is numbered 33; from 31 to 70 the pagination is correct, and then the leaves are numbered thus: 70, 70, 71, 70, 72, 74, 73, 74, 75, 69, 77, 78, 79, 80, 77, 74, 69, 69, 82, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 97, 99, 94, 100, 99, 102, 103, 103, 93, 106, and then on correctly until the last page, except that 115 is numbered 105.

Is it possible that this extraordinary pagination could have escaped the observation of printer, printer's reader, or author? There can only be one answer to this question. There must have been some design in this pagination which has not been revealed.

Upon turning to the First Folio, almost a similar state of apparent negligence is found. But here the object of the mispagination has been unravelled by Mr. E. V. Tanner, who can account for practically every apparent error. It is always unsatisfactory to make assertions without offering evidence in support of them, but to offer such evidence on the point in question in the present article would be impossible. Suffice it to say that every mispagination in the First Folio is intentional and forms part of a design to leave to pos-



terity the data by an application of which to his inductive method Bacon's connection with the publication can be revealed. The writer once more challenges Shakespearean scholars to investigate the evidence which can be advanced in support of this statement.

There the matter must remain for the present. If it is remarkable that this great heritage of the human race should have been sent down to posterity in a volume under circumstances which have led men to say that in it "the corruptions are more numerous and of a grosser kind than can well be conceived but by those who have looked nearly into them"—if it be remarkable that William Jaggard, the printer of repute and excellent work, and Ben Jonson, the scholar and critic, should have permitted their names to be associated with a book so full of errors as to be a literary curiosity—surely any attempt to afford a reasonable explanation should be welcomed by the literary world. If it be proved that the alleged errors in punctuation and pagination are not errors of carelessness or negligence, but are in accordance with the author's design, surely a position has been established which justifies a demand that judgment should be suspended as to the remaining alleged errors until they have been tabulated and, if possible, a reasonable explanation of each one advanced. If the proof be established in two classes of the alleged errors, explanations, which may appear at first sight harder of belief, of other classes must be accepted. If it be proved that the editor, whoever he was, intentionally introduced what appear to be errors as part of a design, having regard to all the circumstances, the onus of proof lies on the attacking party to demonstrate that the explanations of the remaining apparent errors are not accounted for by explanations which can be given.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

## SOMETHING ABOUT ARUNDEL HOUSE, HIGHGATE.

THE mansion where Francis Bacon's death is supposed to have taken place on April 9th, 1626 (Easter Day), belonged to Thomas Howard, Earl Marshall. Lord Arundel, like his wife, had been brought up a Roman Catholic, and was accused of becoming a Protestant from policy. A patron of art, he led a gay Court life at home and abroad. He offended Charles I., and was prevented by that king from taking his place in the House of Lords. During my search (quite a useless one) for any mention of Francis Bacon's death in the "Lords' Journal," the public newspaper of that day, I read a lengthy report of the Appeal of the House to the King for Arundel's return. It appears that the King had a private cause of complaint against Arundel, not a State one. Arundel House stood on The Bank, as Highgate Hill was called, quite near Cromwell House, now a children's hospital. That was built by Oliver for his son-in-law Ireton, and stood opposite Lauderdale House, built by the Duke of Lauderdale in 1600, a man of ill repute, accused of plotting against Charles. Arundel House had been formerly in the possession of the Roman Catholic gentleman, Sir Thomas Cornwallis, Comptroller of the Household to Queen Mary, who received Princess Elizabeth there (1554) on her way to London, and in whose mansion she signed her first State document. The Queen was a visitor there in June, 1589. On May 1st, 1604, a splendid royal fête was held there in honour of James, Ben Jonson being employed to compose a dramatic interlude—*The Penates*—for the private entertainment of the King and Queen. Sir Thomas died at the age of 85 in 1605 at Brome in Suffolk, and in June,

1624, James "towards evening approached to Highgate and lay at the Lord of Arundel's to hunt a stag early next morning in St. John's Wood."

The mansion was taken down in 1825, nothing remaining of it now but an old wall, which I have investigated, at the back of a small house bearing the name of Arundel House in honour of old days. Until now my search for a print of the old mansion in the British Museum and elsewhere has proved unsuccessful. If any reader could aid me in my search I should be grateful.

Norden, in his Survey, 1596, calls it "a Principal Mansion," and describes it as follows:—"Upon this hill is a most pleasant dwelling, yet not so pleasant as healthful for the expert inhabitants report that divers what have long been visited with sickness not curable by physic have in a short time repaired their health by that sweet salutarie air. . . . At this place Cornwalleys Esquire hath a very faire house, from which he may with great delight behold the statelie citie of London, Westminster, and Greenwich . . . the famous river Thames, and countrie towards the South very faire."

Gondemar, the Spanish Ambassador, retreated (1621) to Highgate "to take fresh air." Among the Harleian MSS. is a letter from Sir Thomas Cornwallis, dated "Hygat, July 16th, 1587." 1617 is the first mention I have found of the Earl of Arundel being in possession. King James was then in Scotland; Sir Francis Bacon had just been appointed Lord Keeper,\* and was left by the King at the head of the Privy Council, giving satirical Weldon occasion to say, "he occupied King's lodging at Whitehall, and the State of Royalty." In a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton we

\* Receiving the Seals in Canterbury Mansion, where he resided two years.



read :—" The Countess of Arundel made a grand feast at Highgate to the Lord Keeper, and Lord Justices, Master of the Rolls, etc. " (" Nichol's Progresses," Vol. II., p. 344, and Vol. III., p. 978). It is perhaps worth mentioning that Camden describes " Arondell " as " swallow," *i.e.*, " the gentlemen of which name do bear those birds in their coat armour." One might almost imagine James as he approached " toward evening to Highgate and lay at the Lord of Arundel's," saying—

" This Castle hath a pleasant seat ; the air nimbly and sweetly recommends itself unto our gentle senses."

*First Courtier*.—" This guest of summer, the temple-haunting martlet<sup>o</sup> does approve by his loved mansionry, that the heaven's breath smells wooingly here. . . . Where they most breathe and haunt I have observed the air is delicate" (*Macbeth*, Act V. 1.)

Highgate answered to the requirements of " Arondell " as well as to those of our Shake-spear Bacon, who said such pertinent things about wholesome air, fair houses, and seats well situated on high places. Arundel House stood on a level with the dome of St. Paul's, and was certainly not " set upon a knap of ground environed with higher hills round about it," condemned by Bacon (" Essay of Building ").

Both Bradley and Lefuse, in their Biographies of Princess Arabella Stuart, ignore a most interesting fact alleged by two other writers. William Howitt (" Northern Heights," p. 370) says, " Arundel House numbers amongst its chief historical associations two very different yet very interesting ones, the flight of Arabella Stuart in the reign of King James, and the death of the great Chancellor Bacon about fifteen years afterwards."

Frederick Pricket (" History and Antiquities of High-

<sup>o</sup> " Johnson's Dictionary," a kind of swallow.

gate," p. 75) mentions "Arundel House, famed as the place of imprisonment of the Lady Arabella Stuart \* in 1611," and adds, "the unfortunate Lady Arabella Stuart . . . having been for some time confined at Sir Thomas Parry's House at Lambeth was removed to Arundel House at Highgate where she made her escape."

For many reasons I have long thought it more than probable that Francis Bacon retired from the world in 1626 to devote himself more particularly to literary work of an important nature, giving out that he died for the better carrying out of this scheme. Howitt and Prickett's statements with regard to Arabella making an escape from Arundel House, gave me a clue to the house being provided with easy means of escape. If Arabella Stuart found a way to elude her vigilant caretakers, and Francis Bacon followed suit and disappeared also from the same mansion, were secret passages and hiding-places in it? That this question may be answered in the affirmative there is very little doubt. We have already seen it was successively the home of two noted Roman Catholics, or, as they were then called, Recusants, Sir Thomas Cornwallis heading that list in 1587. That, according to Allan Fea ("Secret Chambers and Hiding-places"), is a sufficient guarantee that anything and everything in the way of sliding panels, double floors, trap doors, innocent-looking cupboards, the backs of which, by removing pegs, swung back into recesses, slanting tunnels, handy ropes dropping fugitives down into cellars and subterranean passages a mile or more in length, not only might, but did exist.

At the time of the Gunpowder Plot Father Garnett and his architect Owen were arrested at Hindlip Hall, Worcester. Built in 1572, it was literally riddled with

\* Lord Arundel's son was Arabella's godson, and his wife was Gilbert Sulbut's daughter.

secret chambers and passages. "Wainscoting, solid brickwork, or stone hearth were equally accommodat- ing, and would swallow up fugitives wholesale, and close over them, to 'open sesame' again only at the hider's pleasure" (Allan Fea, p. 25).

"Owen," says Fea, "devoted the greater part of his life to constructing these places in the principal Roman Catholic houses all over England."

"With incomparable skill . . . he knew how to conduct priests to a place of safety along subterranean passages, to hide them between walls, and bury them in impenetrable recesses, and entangle them in labyrinths and a thousand windings. But what was much more difficult . . . he so disguised the entrances to these as to make them most unlike what they really were." Dunster Castle, Somersetshire, possessed a long, narrow place of concealment in one of the rooms at the *back of a bedstead*. It was no unusual thing, according to Fea, that a secret room was entered from a *principal bedroom*.

Did the "damp bed" of tradition in Arundel House effect for Francis first concealment and then his escape, landing him safe on the Resurrection Morn (a suggestive day) by a Hollow Way far from the spot of his mock funeral? It seems an inconceivable thing that one can find no hint of his funeral, or of any funeral sermon preached, search as one may. The late Dr. Garnett made efforts to help me at the British Museum in a most unsuccessful attempt to trace a first-hand account of Bacon's decease and funeral. Fuller's and Aubrey's accounts are only hearsay after all. Aubrey says Bacon died in Hobbes' arms, adding, "so Hobbes' tells me." Poor testimony after all, for might it not have been Hobbes' part to say so? Dr. Garnett looked up Howitt's "Highgate" for me, which contained the well-known fallacy of the fowl stuffed with snow and



its fatal results. He checked my hilarity by pointing to two references in a foot-note. "Wait, these," he said, "will probably give you what you want." They referred one to the "Lords' Journal" and the other to the "State Calendar" of that date. On looking them up I found the "Lords' Journal" ceased to exist at that time. The "State Calendar" contained in a News letter, "Lord St. Alban died yesterday," so Howitt's references were quite useless.

To return to Owen and his hiding-places. Robert Cecil wrote, "That great joy was caused all through the kingdom by the arrest of Owen, knowing his skill in constructing hiding-places and the innumerable number of these dark holes which he had schemed for hiding priests throughout the kingdom." Tradition exists still that from Cromwell House a subterranean passage once ran across the road to Andrew Marvel's gabled cottage, which stood opposite. The dramatic aspect of an escape such as I suggest would have commended itself to our Great Man. If he reached Muswell Hill or Mitcham, Sir Julius Cæsar's seat, by a sub-way, it might explain Fuller saying he died in the mansion of the Master of the Rolls, who, by the way, is said to have possessed the *secret of longevity*. I wonder sometimes if the preserved fowl had its own part to play in the romance, and whether it was really indurated and tinned and eaten by our scientific refugee, and whether it kept him alive in some hole or deep well till he could get safely away?

The idea of a coffin being weighted with stones and buried without his body being in it, was a scheme which had a parallel in the romantic story of a certain Eva von Trott, a court lady of Duchess Marie of Brunswick, with whom Duke *Heinrich de Jungere* fell in love. His jealous Duchess lived in the "strong Castle on the

Oker" in Wolffenbüttle, mentioned by Francis Bacon in those very words in his "State of Christendom" (1580). It was found expedient that Eva should die of plague, whereas she really escaped from the Castle well and lusty, dressed as a peasant, to another Palace, while a figure of wood lay at peace in the coffin. Years afterwards the coffin was opened and found empty. Eva's youngest son, Eitel Heinrich, was his father's favourite, who wanted the Pope to legitimise him, so as to allow of his succession to the dukedom. But this Eitel withstood, saying: "If Almighty God had wished me to be a Prince, I would have been one, as that was not the case, I shall remain in the position in which He has put me." Duke Julius, to whom Francis Bacon refers in his Political Tract, thought much of his half-brother Eitel, and welcomed him at his Court, with which Francis Bacon seems to have been familiar. Naturally the story of Eitel's mother's mock death and ingenious burial would have been a matter of much interest to the young diplomatist Francis. Neither Eva nor Eitel died till 1597. Eitel was uncle to Duke Heinrich Julius, Queen Anne of Denmark's brother-in-law.

A certain Sir Nicholas Trott, of Gray's Inn, is credited by Hepworth Dixon with being a cousin of Mr. Francis Bacon. If he were a son of Eitel he would be cousin to the Princes Henry and Charles, sons of James. Who was Sir Nicholas Trott of Gray's Inn, whose whole fortune had been engaged in 1597 for the service of Mr. F. Bacon, the year of the death of Eitel Heinrich of Brunswick?

Mrs. Pott has reasons for thinking that, after his escape from England and its civil war, Bacon lived in Germany to a *very great age*. If we study his "*Historia Vitæ et Mortis*," we shall find an extraordinary interest exhibited in longevity, many examples being given of

human life extending long over the normal three-score years and ten.

Let these things be enquired into.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

## CHEVERIL THE LAWYER.

ON reading through the Rev. Walter Begley's "Is it Shakespeare?" I was pleased to find (pages 83—93) an able statement of the theory that Ovid junior in Ben Jonson's "Poetaster" is a caricature of young Francis Bacon.\* In my copy (The Mermaid Series, edited by Brinsley Nicholson and C. H. Herford), Ovid junior is pronounced to be *Ben Jonson*, which (before reading "Is it Shakespeare?") I had altered to Francis Bacon. What connection there can be between Ovid junior and Ben Jonson is certainly a puzzle, and the editors of this edition do not let us into the secret. Horace is undoubtedly Ben Jonson, but no suggestion is made as to who is the Æsculapius who administers the pills. Marcus Ovidius (the father of the young law student who finds that, like Bacon, "the contemplative planet" carries him away) undoubtedly represents Lord Burghley. Although, from the letters which have come down to us, Burghley seems to have been sympathetic towards Bacon's "rare and unaccustomed suit," we cannot judge exactly what attitude he adopted upon discovering his nephew's wish to avoid the law in order to carry out his "vast contemplative ends." I do not overlook his letter to Burghley dated 6th May, 1586, where he says:—

\* This suggestion was previously made in "Shakespeare-Bacon, An Essay," by Mr. I. M. Smeaton, published in 1899 (Swan, Sonnenschiew and Co). "Is it Shakespeare?" was published in 1903.—ED. BACONIANA.



"I take it as an undoubted sign of your Lordship's favour unto me that being hardly informed of me you took occasion rather of *good advice* than of *evil opinion* thereby."

His Lordship's "admonition" was probably more severe than we can gather from this letter.

In the "Poetaster" I. i., Ovid is discovered in his study writing poetry in the Shakespearian vein :—

*Ovid.*—"Then, when this body falls in funeral fire,  
My name shall live, and my best part aspire."  
It shall go so.

Then the servant Luscus enters, and gives warning of the approach of Ovid senior.

*Ovid, sen.*—"Your name shall live" indeed sir! you say true : but how infamously, how scorned and contemned in the eyes and ears of the best and gravest Romans; that, you think not on; you never so much as dream of that. Are these the fruits of all my travail and expenses? Is this the scope and aim of thy studies? are these the hopeful courses, wherewith I have so long flattered my expectation from thee? Verses? Poetry? Ovid, whom I thought to see the pleader, become Ovid the play-maker?

*Ovid, jun.*—No, sir.

*Ovid, sen.*—Yes, sir. I hear of a tragedy of yours coming forth for the common players there, called "Medea."  
. . . What? shall I have my son a stager now? An ingler for players? . . . Methinks, if nothing else, yet this alone, the very reading of the public edicts, should fright thee from commerce with them [*i.e.* the players] and give thee distaste enough of their actions. But this betrays what a student you are; this argues your proficiency in the law!

*Ovid, jun.*—They wrong me, sir, and do abuse you more,  
That blow your ears with these untrue reports.  
*I am not known upon the open stage,  
Nor do I traffic in their theatres.*  
Indeed, I do acknowledge, at request

Of some near friends, and honourable Romans,  
I have begun a poem of that nature.

*Ovid, sen.*—You have, sir, a poem? And where is it? That's the law you study!

*Ovid, jun.*—Cornelius Gallus borrowed it to read.

*Ovid, sen.*—Cornelius Gallus! There's another gallant too hath drunk of the same poison; and Tibullus and Propertius. But these are gentlemen of means, and revenues now. *Thou art a younger brother, and hast nothing but thy bare exhibition*; which I protest shall be bare indeed, if thou forsake not these unprofitable by-courses, and that timely too. Name me a profest poet, that his poetry did ever afford him so much as a competency.

It is asserted in "Is it Shakespeare?" that Scene IV. of act iv. (Scene VIII. in old editions) between Ovid and Julia ("at her chamber window") is "a striking, a clever parody on *Romeo and Juliet*, and so fits in with the rest of Ben Jonson's allusions throughout his 'Poetaster,' and gives us good ground for thinking that he, at least, as early as 1602, had got to know that Bacon was the author of *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Richard II.*"

The allusion to Bacon-Shake-speare is strengthened by the paraphrase of the lines from Ovid's "Amores" prefixed to *Venus and Adonis* in the lawyer-poet's soliloquy (Act I. i.)

Kneel hinds to trash: me let bright Phœbus swell,  
With cups full flowing from the Muses' well.

I see it is affirmed that it was Bacon who stirred up the authorities against the "Poetaster," Jonson's epigrams on Cheveril, the lawyer being quoted in support of this contention:—

#### EPIGRAM LIV.

Cheveril cries out my verses libels are;  
And threatens the Star-Chamber and the Bar.

## Cheveril the Lawyer.

What are thy petulant pleadings, Cheveril, then,  
That quit'st the cause so oft, and rail'st at men.

## EPIGRAM XXXVII.

*On Cheveril the Lawyer.*

No cause, nor client fat, will Cheveril leese,  
But as they come, on both sides he takes fees,  
And pleaseth both ; for while he melts his grease  
For this ; that wins, for whom he holds his peace.

It escaped the notice of the Rev. Walter Begley that the name F. BAcoN appears in this epigram, as I have marked it. Can this be another coincidence ?

Tucca tells Ovid that he will be happy as a lawyer "when it shall be in the power of thy *cheveril* conscience to do right or wrong at thy pleasure."

If Luscus is Shakspeare, support is given to the tradition of his minding horses.

*Ovid, sen.* (to Luscus).—Sirrah, go get my horses ready. You'll still be prating.

*Tuc.*—Do, you perpetual stinkard, do, go ; talk to tapsters and ostlers, you slave ; they are i' your element, go.

With reference to the love scene between the *banished* Ovid and Julia there is a footnote in my copy of the "Poetaster" by the editor of the Mermaid edition reading as follows:—"Gifford rightly calls this 'a ridiculous love scene,' and 'not much in the manner of Ovid.' I should say, not at all."

R. EAGLE.



## “I AM THAT I AM.”

**I**N “The Mystery of Francis Bacon,” Mr. Smedley says (commenting upon the “Mente Videbor” emblem in Peacham’s “Minerva Britannia”) “At a very early age, probably before he was 12, he had conceived the idea that he would imitate God, and would hide his works in order that they might be found out—that he would be seen only by his mind and that his image should be concealed.” There can be no harm in repeating the evidence upon which this contention is based. In the preface to the “Novum Organum,” Bacon writes :—

“Whereas of the sciences, which regard nature, the Holy Philosopher declares that ‘it is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but it is the glory of the King to find it out.’ Even as though the Divine Nature took pleasure in the innocent and kindly sport of children playing at hide-and-seek, and vouchsafed of his kindness and goodness to admit the human spirit for his play-fellow in that game.” This idea was impressed very deeply upon Bacon’s mind, for in the “Promus of Formularies” (1594—6), he had jotted down :—

“The glory of God is to conceale a thing and the glory of man is to fynd out a thing.”

Again in the preface to the “Advancement of Learning” (1640, Wats’ translation) we find :—

“For of the knowledges which contemplate the works of Nature, the holy Philosopher hath said expressly : that the glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of the King is to find it out : as if the Divine Nature, according to the innocent and sweet play of children, which hide themselves to the end they may be found ; took delight to hide his works, to the end they

might be found out ; and of his indulgence and goodness to mankind, had chosen the Soule of man to be his Play-fellow in this game."

On page 45 of the same work, the identical fancy is again repeated.

In the Authorised version of The Bible, Exodus iii., 13, 14, there is written :—

13. And Moses said unto God, Behold *when* I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you ; and they shall say to me, What *is* His name ? what shall I say unto them ?

14. And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM, and He said, Thus shalt they say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

In Sonnet CXXI. Shakespeare writes :—

No.—I am that I am ; and they that level  
At my abuses reckon up their own.

Curiously enough this is also in connection with invisibility to the eyes of men.

'Tis better to be vile, than vile esteemed,  
When not to be receives reproach of being,  
And the just pleasure lost, which is so deem'd  
Not by our feeling, but by others' *seeing*.  
For why should others' false adulterate eyes  
Give salutation to my sportive blood ?  
Or on my frailties why are frailer spies,  
Which in their wills count bad what I think good ?  
No.—*I am that I am* ; and they that level  
At my abuses, reckon up their own :  
I may be straight, though they themselves be bevel ; \*

\* Bevel—coined by Shakespeare from the old French "*Buveau*" (a kind of compass, but with a straight and a slanting pole at a fixed angle). The word does not appear to have come into general use until the beginning of the 19th century since Malone (1790) quotes Steevens for an explanation :—"Bevel—*i.e.*, *crooked* a term used only, I believe, by masons and joiners."

By their rank thoughts *my deeds must not be shown* ;  
 Unless this **general** evil they maintain,—  
 All men are bad, and in their badness reign.

This Sonnet has been quoted by short-sighted orthodoxy as proving the author to have been a man of ungovernable animal passions. Anything will be accepted so long as it can be reconciled with "William the Conqueror,"—the hero of the escapade recorded in Manningham's Diary ! It would appear, however, that William Shagsper did not take great precaution that his "sportive" deeds should "not be shown" !

What does this Sonnet mean ? Attention must first of all be directed towards the elucidation of "sportive blood," and assuming the Baconian authorship, difficulties at once disappear. Poesie was esteemed vile, and contemporary literature tells us that on account of "the scorn and ordinary disgrace offered unto poets," such writings were usually published anonymously, or with some other name to them. Dramatic poesie was even viler esteemed, and such "deeds must not be shown." Of *Poesy* Bacon writes : "For as all knowledge is the exercise and work of the mind, so poesy may be regarded as its *sport*. With these individuals and with this material (history, poesy, and philosophy) the human mind perpetually exercises itself and *sometimes sports*."

In a letter to Sir Tobie Matthew, Bacon writes :—

"I have sent you some copies of my book of the 'Advancement,' which you desired, and a little *work of my recreation* which you desired not."

The association with Poesy is again referred to as "sport" in John Davies' Sonnet (addressed "To the royall, ingenious and all learned Knight, Sir Francis Bacon"), in the lines :—

And to thy health in Helicon to drinke  
 As to her Bellamour the Muse is wont :

For thou dost her embozom ; and, dost use  
Her company for *sport* twixt grave affaires.

Ben Jonson in his lines prefixed to the first Folio makes comparison between the author Shakespeare and "sporting Kyd." There is certainly nothing particularly "sporting" in Kyd's writings.

In Sonnet CXXI. we find "Shakespeare's" declaration of his concealment so far as his "sportive" creations are concerned, and in CXXII., CXXIII. and CXXIV., the confidence that Time will restore his "name and memory."

Both Shakespeare and Bacon were impressed with the concealment of the Divine Being who "took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out."

The idea of the "Mente Videbor" emblem (which shows a hand protruding from behind a curtain, which is drawn to conceal the figure) is, I think, derived from the same source :—

"I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments" (Exodus vi. 6). Thus has Bacon left his "memorial unto all generations."

R. EAGLE.

## DID BACON DIE IN 1626?

MAY I be permitted a few further notes on this question? It may be perfectly true that Bacon died as stated by Rawley. On the other hand, he may have only become dead to the world on that day, and that we are faced with the solution of yet another of the problems he set for the justification of inductive methods of reasoning. "The glory of God is to conceal a thing, the glory of the King is to find it out."

1. The letters to Jane Lady Cornwallis (who became



Lady Jane Bacon by a subsequent marriage) do not help the point very much.

2. The announcement in April, 1626, "My Lo. St Albans is dead and buried," may have been only repetition of the unauthoritative talk of the moment or a permissible misstatement from a person desirous of facilitating a carefully planned yet harmless escape.

3. But the letter was not written by Mr. Thomas Meautys, who had been Bacon's private secretary, and was then Clerk to the Council of Charles I. It came from that gentleman's cousin of the same name, who had, close upon the date of Bacon's last will, 19th December, 1625, lent Bacon £300, and, as a creditor who was interested in preserving what could be saved of Bacon's estate, had a claim to early information. He was subsequently made joint administrator.

4. The ex-secretary and Lady Jane were brother and sister, the latter marrying for her second husband Nathaniel, son of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, and the former marrying later on than 1626 for his second wife Anne, a daughter of Sir Nathaniel. Brother and sister, therefore, both married children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon. It was (see p. 258 BACONIANA, 1679) the ex-secretary (and not the writer of the letter) who erected the monument in St. Michael's, Gorhambury.

5. The reference to the secretary in the cousin's letter, namely that he—the ex-secretary—was off to the Low Countries for six weeks, is to an extent remarkable.

If Bacon retired to the Continent in April, 1626, his friend and former secretary—this "man of immense energy and business organisation" (to quote from Mrs. Bunten)—would have been a most suitable travelling companion.

6. I have already noticed the curious references to Bacon's "sickness" in the "Translation of Psalms," and,

again, in the "Apophthegms," both printed in 1625. In the 1625 will Bacon again referred to his "sickness." Yet in his private letters about that period he wrote of improving health, and indicated a happy and merry frame of mind.

7. Arundel House, Highgate, where this "sickness" took apparently a final shape, formerly belonged to Sir William Cornwallis, Lady Jane's first husband. He was a recusant, but a rich man, and friend of Robert Earl of Essex, whom he accompanied to Ireland in 1599. Queen Elizabeth visited the house in 1589; James I. in 1604. As the house of a recusant, it probably had hiding places and secret passages for escape.

8. Rawley's conduct over this "death" business was very perplexing. I have already alluded to some incidents. Why, if Bacon were dead, Rawley should not have published the "Life" with the Latin edition of Bacon's works in 1638, instead of deferring it until 1657, is difficult to understand.

The use, moreover, of the word *mortuus* on the portrait in the "Sylva Sylvarum," 1627, may have been correct Latin, yet was consistent with a double meaning, such as that Bacon became "dead to the world" on 9th April, 1626. And if I may be permitted to reaffirm my confidence in the existence of the biliteral cipher and its, on the whole, fairly correct decipherment, why did Rawley, in the "Miscellany Works," 1629, write in cipher of Bacon as then dead? If he were not dead, the cipher might have been entrusted with the truth. Of course, he may not have then known the contrary (so that the blunder in the "Sylva" preface was accidental only), or fearing that through aid of the "De Augmentis" (1623) instructions, someone would soon decipher the biliteral, he dared not write the truth about his old master in that form of cipher. We must

bear in mind the large and extensive use of cipher writing in that period, and the many experts engaged in the art of deciphering. Rawley might well have been in fear.

PARKER WOODWARD.

## "RESUSCITATIO," 1657.

IT is to be hoped that some person experienced in the evolution and history of the art of letterpress printing may bring his knowledge to bear upon the above book. Compiled in an age of cipher writing, it would be interesting to ascertain whether the "Resuscitatio" is merely what it outwardly purports to be—a collection of tractates, speeches and letters by Bacon—or is incidentally or primarily the vehicle of some important cipher communications.

The "Resuscitatio" bears evidence of very careful preparation, and a long period from Bacon's "Dying Day" elapsed before it was published.

The reasons given for publication are not very clear. The tractates, according to the preface, were directed to be preserved from perishing, and to have been reposed in some private shrine or library; so that in publishing them as he did, Rawley disobeyed his Lordship's wishes.

In "The Lost Manuscripts," Mrs. Gallup printed a decipher of a biliteral cypher inserted by Rawley in this edition of the "Resuscitatio."

The decipher is difficult to understand, but it would appear that Rawley introduced a triliteral cypher as well as the biliteral. He also refers to a track set, but at that date not yet followed nor yet seen. The "Resuscitatio," 1657, contains the first essay towards a Life of Bacon.

The curious way in which it is printed leads one to

think it conveys other messages in other cypher than the biliteral.

The "U" in Honourable being the fifth letter is wrong fount, and is rendered by an inverted "N."

In the word "his" three lines below, the "i" is remarkable in that it has a stroke on each side, so that it is shaped like an arrow, and points to the letter A in Francis. The Elizabethan alphabet had twenty-four letters, N being the first of the second twelve. It would almost appear that in the cypher, if there be one, a letter "A" represents "N"; "B" represents "O," and so on.

The "Life" is printed partly in Roman, partly in Italic type, but seems to follow no apparent rule of selection.

A topographical name is in Roman type in one place; for instance, "Highgate," while a similar place name, for instance, "Strand," is in Italic. Nouns, adverbs, adjectives are sometimes in the one type, sometimes in the other.

Another odd feature is the extraordinary number of capital letters.

So is the large frequency in the use of punctuation marks, in many cases certainly unnecessary for the sense of the printed matter.

These punctuation marks, whether commas, full stops, colons or semi-colons, are in three or more sizes. These variations may serve as indicia of the letters in the preceding or following words, forming part of some cypher statement or messages. There is also an unusual use of words in brackets, generally beginning with the word "as." These interjected words could mostly have been omitted without damage to the narration. There are differences in the cut of the brackets themselves, which differences may again indicate the letters of the internal message to be selected.

It may be that these numerous variations have no



real significance, and persons expert in the lore of printing may be able to explain that they mean nothing but the result of badly cut type. On the other hand, if small variations of type enabled a biliteral cypher to be constructed, such an explanation would hardly carry conviction. It is manifest that in an age of cypher writing the desire to convey cypher messages in print could very easily be carried out by a clever arrangement of letters indicated by capitals and by differences in types, and particularly by differences in punctuation marks.

Deciphering, according to the late Mr. Bidder, Q.C., requires for its success a quick power of perception and a readiness with difficulties.

To this must be conjoined a willingness to plod and experiment and considerable patience.

In view of the valuable deposits of documents which Bacon would seem to have made, one may well quote to those willing to try deciphering, the lines which Bacon wrote:—

“There is a tide in the affairs of man which,  
Taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.”

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

## “THE ATHENÆUM” OWES AN APOLOGY.

“THE ATHENÆUM” has been regarded as a journal in which may be placed reliance on statements made on literary subjects. It was, therefore, with some surprise that a correspondent read in a review appearing in it, on “Shakespeare and Stratford,” by Mr. Henry C. Shelley, the following paragraph: “The author states that no early writers refer to ‘Shakespeare’s birthplace’; that few of his contem-

poraries even knew he belonged to Stratford-on-Avon until the appearance of the First Folio. Indeed, few were aware of the connection of Shakespeare with Stratford-on-Avon until Dugdale appeared in 1656. This is a mistake. Before the latter date Davenant, William Camden, James Shirley, Samuel Sheppard, and several less known writers had definitely associated Shakespeare with Stratford; not, it is true, with the Henley Street House."

A letter was addressed to the editor of the "Athenæum," pointing out that it would be of considerable interest to many of the readers of his journal if the reviewer would give references to where these allusions might be found. The Editor courteously replied, "Your question is of interest, but I hardly feel justified in occupying our reviewer's time in answering it, especially at a time when he is out of reach of books. Mrs. Stopes' book on the Bacon-Shakespeare question supplies, I think, some of the evidence required."

Mr. Shirley is correct in his statement, and the reviewer is wrong. Nowhere have Davenant, William Camden, or Samuel Sheppard, or any less known writers definitely associated Shakespeare with Stratford before Dugdale's "Antiquities of Warwickshire" appeared in 1656, with the sole exception mentioned by Mr. Shirley of the First Folio, 1623.

The only reference which Mrs. Stopes gives has no separate historical value. It is as follows:—

1647. "The flowing compositions of the then-expired Sweet Swan of Avon—Shakspere.

"James Shirley, Dedicatory Epistle of Ten Players.

"(Beaumont & Fletcher's works)."

This is simply a quotation from Jonson's panegyric prefixed to the First Folio. Shagspere had been dead and buried for seven years before there is any suggestion

put forth that Stratford-on-Avon was in any way associated with the author of the plays. Then it is to be found in the two expressions, "Sweet swan of Avon," and "Thy Stratford monument." There is after this a break of thirty-three years before Dugdale produces an engraving of the Stratford Monument with its curious inscription :

Judicio Pylium, Genio Socratem, Arte Maronem,  
Terra Tegit, Populus Maeret, Olympus Habet.

Not a word about the man to whose memory the monument is erected being either dramatist, poet or actor ! But his judgment is likened to that of Ulysees, his genius to that of Socrates, and his art to that of Virgil. To say the least of it, the inscription is a curious one to be found on the tomb of the Stratford man. At the date of its erection, which was probably about 1622, who had discerned the existence of these qualities even in the author of the great dramas ? This inscription is by no means one of the least important links in the chain of evidence as to the Baconian authorship. It should, at least, have the effect of setting some of the distinguished men of letters thinking.

## THE STRATFORD PLAYER.

## HIS NAME.

**N**UMEROUS though the discussions have been on the above subject, there has, as far as I know, never been any attempt to treat the matter etymologically, and to trace the Shaksper or Shaxper name, as in the case of other surnames, to its origin. Perhaps a few words devoted to this object may not be thrown away.

What, then, is, or was, the Player's real name, and whence was it derived? That it was not "Shakespeare"—which, indeed, is no family name at all, but a mere literary compound, "Shake-speare"—is so evident, and now, as I think, so universally admitted, except by those whom no evidence can convince, that I will not stop to discuss the point, but proceed to inquire what was the name the Player went by amongst those who knew him in the flesh. This is not difficult to determine, for, though the name is said to have been written in some sixty different ways, these are only some sixty different attempts to express on paper the manner in which the several writers of it heard it pronounced. For, as in those days the art of writing was not common, a scribe taking down a man's name had nothing else to guide him but its pronunciation by the owner or some one else who was acquainted with it, and as one scribe's ear might not always agree with another's on the "catching" of the sound, differences in the registering of the sound phonetically would naturally occur. Hence the great variety of forms in which one and the same name (in sound) might appear.

But in the examination of the no less than sixty forms in which the Actor's name, or that of his family, has been written, two clear results emerge, namely that the first syllable always represents the sound now given to



"Shack," or "Shak," or "Shax" (never to "Shake"), and the second to "per," or "pur" (never to "pere," as in spere).

Phonetically, the name of the Stratford Player may, therefore, be said to be fairly represented by any or all of the various forms it has taken in writing, as Shaksper, Shaxper, Shaksber, Shaxper, and the rest, but which of these is the more correct must be determined by its derivation, which has not yet been considered.

As to this, the word "shack" I have found in the course of my reading (though, unfortunately, I have not taken note of and cannot at this moment give, the references in books) stands for a "cot," a "hut," or "shanty," and is still used in that sense among the navvies for their temporary dwellings, as also by the campers-out in the prairies of Canada and the U.S.A. A "shack's-ber," therefore, should be (and, I believe, is) nothing more than a shack's-dweller, a dweller in a "shack," equivalent to a cottager, the Saxon term "bûr" (appearing in "neighbour," &c.), meaning a dweller, from the Gothic "bûan," to dwell.

And, this being the derivation of the word, it follows that the correct spelling of it, as I submit, should be "Shacksber," or (by the well-known law of consonant mutation) "Shaksper," or (omitting the unnecessary consonant c) "Shaksper."

And this is the form in which, with the addition of a final "e," the name appears in the Stratford Church Baptismal Register, but the final "e" is probably but the flourish usually appended to the German or old English "r," and does not affect the pronunciation.

"Shaksper," therefore (the correct form of the Player's name), I think, is not "Shakespeare," and has no sort of connection with it. It has no "warlike sound" about it, to use old Fuller's phrase, as the famous pseudonym—taken from the "Hasti-vibrans" of

Pallas—has. It speaks to us of much humbler things, though that, of course, is no reproach to it. Halliwell-Phillips tells us that "Shaksperes" were very numerous in Warwickshire, which is not to be wondered at, for did not Warwickshire contain the extensive Forest of Arden, where "shacks," or huts, or shanties, would "doubtless," as Sir Sidney Lee would say, be plentifully provided for the woodmen and others dwelling therein? No doubt the "cottage" which Rosalind found there was a "shack" (*As You Like It*, II. iv.), and the dweller therein would be a Shacks-ber or Shaksper. \*

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—As the objects of the Bacon Society include a complete "record of all works of contemporaries in which reference is made to Bacon," I enclose the accompanying lines found in Francis Osborn's "Advice to a Son," 1873 edition, Part II., p. 150. It is suggestive to find copious coffee "sprayings" in the pages indicated.

Yours truly,

"A SNAPPER-UP OF UNCONSIDERED TRIFLES."

"My memory neither doth, nor, I believe, possible ever can, direct me to an example more splendid in this kind than Lord Bacon, Earl of St. Albans, who in all companies did appear a good proficient, if not a master, in those arts entertained for the subject of everyone's discourse. So as I dare maintain, without the least affectation of flattery or hyperbole, that his most casual talk deserveth to be written: as I have been told that his first or foulest copies required no great labour to render them competent for the nicest judgments. A high perfection attainable only by use, and treating with every man in his respective profession, and what he was most versed in! So as I have heard him entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time outcant a London chirurgeon. Thus did he not only learn himself, but gratify such as taught him; who looked upon their callings as honored through his notice. Nor did an easy falling into argument—not unjustly taken for a blemish in the most—appear less than an ornament in him: the ears of the hearers receiving more gratification than trouble; and

so not less sorry when he came to conclude than displeased with any did interrupt him. Now, this general knowledge he had in all things, husbanded by his wit, and dignified by so majestical a carriage he was known to own, struck such an awful reverence in those he questioned, that they durst not conceal the most intrinsic part of their mysteries from, for fear of appearing ignorant or saucy. All of which rendered him no less necessary than admirable at the council table, where in reference to impositions, monopolies, &c., the meanest manufactures were an usual argument; and, as I have heard, did in this baffle the Earl of Middlesex that was born and bred a citizen. Yet without any great (if at all) interrupting his other studies, as is not hard to be imagined of a quick apprehension in which he was admirable."

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The first play exhibited in England before James I. was at Wilton, Lord Pembroke's home, and it was presented by Shakespeare's Company " (*Life and Times of Arabella Stuart*," by M. Lefuse, p. 153). A very near relation of the late Lord Pembroke told me that at Wilton in an old chest is preserved a letter from the Lord Pembroke of those old days, saying (as far as I can remember), "The man Shakespeare comes to-night." Cannot a sight of this letter be obtained and possibly a transcript made of it? Yours sincerely, ALICIA A. LEITH.

[Application was made some time ago to Lord Pembroke for permission to inspect the letter, but it cannot now be found. —ED. B.]

---

## Date of Bacon's Death.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The Thomas Meautys who, according to Mrs. Buntens's article, used the words "My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried" in a letter written about April, 1626, to Lady Jane Bacon, formerly Cornwallis, was not the Thomas Meautys who was Bacon's friend and secretary, and who erected the monument in St. Michael's Church. This should account for the unemotional statement. Thomas Meautys the secretary was the brother of Lady Jane Bacon, who, curiously enough, was reported in the letter to be going to the Low Countries. Was he escorting his escaping old master? The Earl of Arundel's house at Highgate had, prior to 1617, belonged to Sir William Cornwallis, a recusant, and possessed secret passages, so Miss Leith informs me.

Amongst the decipherings published by Mrs. Gallup under the title of "The Lost Manuscripts," is a cipher placed by Rawley in the Miscellany Works, 1629, containing the words, "We will give

F. Bacon our devoted service, although his own labours have at length ceased and he sleeps in the tombe."

One would hardly think Rawley would place such a statement in cipher unless he had been kept in ignorance and honestly believed Bacon to be dead or feared an early de-coding of the cipher, and therefore repeated by way of precaution an allegation he knew to be technically untrue. This appears to have been Rawley's first essay in ciphering, except a little bit in the Apophthegmes, 1625, and he may have been nervous.

PARKER WOODWARD.

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—It is seldom that two articles appear in one magazine which contradict each other, but I find this is the case in the January 1914 number of BACONIANA.

This shows the Editor is willing to air all views ; but is it not true that *one fact* is better than a whole bag of conjectures, even though the latter are cleverly arranged by a lawyer accustomed to "plead"? I allude to Mr. Parker Woodward's article of twelve pages, arguing that Bacon did not die in 1626, as against Mrs. A. C. Bunten's three pages, showing by the best proof possible that Bacon's heir and former Secretary wrote a letter saying, "My Lord St. Albans is dead and buried"; this letter being written about a fortnight after Bacon's death towards the end of April, 1626.

Before that time Bacon was in leisurely retirement from the busy world, and could spend his time as he liked. In fact, had he continued to write further histories, and books of science signed with his name, it is probable that his earnings might have brought in more money to pay his creditors. To pretend to die would have been an unworthy subterfuge to give his heirs the whole disagreeable task of disentangling his involved affairs, and leaving the trustees at the mercy of the clamouring creditors.

This we cannot believe Bacon would stoop to do. The letter quoted by Mr. Woodward, which was dictated by Bacon to his Secretary, and addressed to the Earl of Arundel, shows no desire to end his life, or to disappear.

Nor can we believe that Bacon, desirous to know in what estimation he was held by men of letters, pretended to die, so that he might read what Mr. Woodward calls "dirges of sorrow."

In the October number of 1913, Mrs. A. C. Bunten brought forward several printed notices of contemporaries, and others who wrote upon Bacon's death and burial, while Mr. Woodward has failed to find any such printed proof of a later date for the death, and his "considerations" are merely "speculations."

Mrs. Pott asserts that Bacon lived to the great age of 108, but what we know of his delicate health precludes that conclusion, and no positive proof has been shown to justify this idea.

Mr. Woodward is right in talking of "blundering Rawley," for



this weak old man was not one of the "literati," and shows unmistakably how frightened he was to write any disagreeable facts ; and his memory also sadly failed him, so that no details of such a great man as Bacon was, are put down in his memoirs, much to our grief.

Mr. Woodward is hard to convince against his will, but he must search still further, and must remember that the world looks for "facts" and not "speculations."

I remain,

A LOVER OF FACTS.

---

Miss A. A. Leith sends the following extract from the familiar letters of JAMES HOWELL, which bears upon the same subject.

LETTER 8.

(To Dr. Pritchard.)

SIR,—Since I was beholden to you for your many favours in Oxford, I have not heard from you (*ne gry quidem*) I pray let the wonted correspondence be now reviv'd, and receive new vigour between us.

My Lord Chancellor Bacon is lately dead of a long languishing weakness ; he died so poor that he scarce left money to bury him, which tho' he had a great wit, did argue no great wisdom ; it being one of the essential properties of a wise man, to provide for the main chance. I have read, that it had been the fortunes of all poets commonly to die beggars ; but for an orator, a lawyer, and philosopher, as he was, to die so, 'tis rare. It seems the same fate befell him that attended Demosthenes, Seneca, and Cicero (all great men) of whom, the two first fell by corruption. The fairest diamond may have a flaw in it, but I believe he died poor out of a contempt of the pelf of fortune, as also out of an excess of generosity, which appear'd, as in divers other passages, so once when the King had sent him a stag, he sent up for the under-keeper, and having drunk the King's health to him in a great silver-gilt bowl, he gave it to him for his fee.

He writ a pitiful letter to King James, not long before his death, and concludes :—" Help me, dear Sovereign Lord and Master, and pity me so far, that I who have been born to a *Bag*, be not now in my age forc'd in effect to bear a *wallet* ; nor that I who desire to live to study, may be driven to study to live." Which words in my opinion, argued a little abjection of spirit, as his former letter to the Prince did of profaneness, wherein he hop'd that as the father was his creator, the son will be his redeemer. I write not this to derogate from the noble worth of the Lord Viscount Verulam, who was a rare man ; a man *Reconditæ scientiæ*, and *ad salutem literarum natus*, and I think the eloquentest that was born in this isle. They say he shall be the last Lord Chancellor, as Sir Edward Coke was the last Lord Chief Justice of England ; for ever since they have been termed Lord Chief Justices of the King's-bench : so hereafter they shall

be only Keepers of the Great Seal, which for title and office, are deposable ; but they say the Lord Chancellor's title is indelible.

I was lately at Gray's-Inn with Sir Eubule, and he desir'd me to remember him to you, as I do also salute *Meum Pritchardum ex imis præcordiis, vale* (Greek here follows).

Yours affectionately, while

J. H.

London, 6 January, 1625.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In Mrs. Bunten's interesting article, entitled "Jottings on Lord Bacon," in the October BACONIANA, an extract is given from a "History of the Reign of Charles I.," dated 1656, which, on the face of it, seems to leave no doubt that Viscount St. Albans did die, as commonly supposed, in 1626 ; but things are not always what they seem, and I shall be glad if you can find space in your columns for another possible explanation.

Mrs. Bunten herself gives the clue by remarking that "Any student of the original editions of Lord Bacon's works would take this book for a companion volume to Bacon's 'Henry VII.' though published thirty-two years after that history appeared. It is a thin folio, printed with exactly the same variety of type that strikes the reader as being so strange in Bacon's history, with the double lines for marginal notes, and some of the head-pieces of ornamentation exactly similar."

Now let us assume for the moment that the actual date of Bacon's death is, as some people believe—myself among the number—one of the many mysteries connected with that great man, and that he did not really die till 1668. In that case, the "History of Charles I." may have been, and almost certainly was, as "any student would take it to be," a companion volume to the "Henry VII." written by Bacon himself. What, then, is the real meaning of the story he gives us that when "his ancient servant," Sir Thomas Meautys, who erected the monument in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, was buried in 1649, "it was his lot to be inhumed so nigh his lord's sepulchre that, in the forming of his grave, part of the viscount's body was exposed to view, which being spied by a doctor of physick, he demanded the head be given him, and did most shamefully disport himself with that shell which was somewhere the continent of so vast treasure of knowledge."

The explanation is simple. No doubt all this did happen exactly as narrated, except that the body was not, as everyone assumed, his lordship's. We can imagine that the words "most shamefully" were a touch of true feeling and that he gladly availed himself of the incident, then but 7 years old, in order to baffle any possible keen-scented curiosity as to the identity of the author of the book on which he was engaged.

Yours faithfully,

ERNEST UDNY.

93, Linden Gardens, W., November 3rd, 1913.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

You courteously gave me an opportunity to examine four 16th century books from your private collection, viz.,

"Bishop's Beautiful Blossoms," by John Bishop	pub. 1577
"The French Academy," by Pierre de la Primaudaye	pub. 1586
"The Dial of Princes," by Ludowicke Lloide	" 1586
"The Felicitie of Man, by Sir Richard Barckley	" 1598

I think there is no doubt as to their common authorship; they show a variety of care and uncare, but the same prompting mind, the same purpose, design, and "handwriting." They read to me as though they were *studies* of the "prentice hand" [but what a "prentice"] of the great artist diligently and thoroughly gathering up his material for big work—making "essaies" into history and human nature, not yet with mind and imagination aglow with divine passion; the furnace of that glorious fire was *then yet* to be kindled to its whiter heat, and the material gathered and garnered in these book storehouses was destined to be consumed, transformed, and re-created by the alchemy of his genius into the perfect poetry of plays like the *Tempest*.

In the "Dial of Princes" in the last fifteen lines of Address to the Reader, it says, "For the Gymnophosists of India the Prophetes in Egypt . . . are now more famous and renowned being dead than they being alive were envied and slandered," &c., &c. It concludes with a few tactful, deferential words similar to those found in some of the prefaces and epilogues of the Shakespeare Plays. Compare the above with last few lines of Bacon's "History of Henry 7th," and we find "*In that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his Tombe than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces. I could wish he did the like in this monument of his Fame.*" He then goes on with his customary form of graceful self-depreciation while in front of the greater importance of his subject—the genuine self-abnegation of the true artist, anxious first to present and exalt his ideal undistracted to the attention of his audience—the actor-artist—showing his dramatic sense. Turn the object of our admiration any way, he comes out consistent and always fascinating.

May the hypothesis contained in these notes on these extremely valuable old books soon be demonstrated to the satisfaction of all Baconians.

H. J. HADRILL.

Northwood, Chislehurst, December 4th, 1913.

## The Writer of Weekly Accounts.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence, in his book *Bacon is Shakespeare*, says, with reference to *The Great Assises* of Wilter's—

"William Shakespeare is 'The Writer of Weekly Accounts.' This exactly describes him, for the only literature for which he was responsible was the accounts sent out by his clerk or attorney."

This statement, however, cannot be taken as a correct reading, for in the charge made against this malefactor he is said to be :—

"He who weekly did pretend  
Accounts of certain news abroad to send,  
He was accus'd, that he with pamphlets vain  
The art of lying had sought to maintain."

I came across lately in the British Museum a newspaper with the title of "The Weekly Account," dated 1645, "containing special and remarkable passages from both houses of Parliament." I also found news-sheets entitled

Mercurius Britannicus	..	..	..	..	1645
Mercurius Civicus	..	..	..	..	1644
Mercurius Anlicus	...	..	..	..	1642
The Scottish Dove	...	..	...	..	1644

All these names are used to designate malefactors arraigned at the "Assises," and it might be interesting to trace the exact connection if this has not been done already.

F. LOCKHART CLARKE.

## Ignoto.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The essay on the above subject by Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame is, indeed, admirable; but is he not mistaken in treating the A1 A1 Cipher Code as a standard Baconian system, seeing that it is not in any way a secret one? It certainly, by a wonderful coincidence, gives the message Bacon 33, but otherwise it must often be regarded as a "foil."

"Ignoto" is not to be based on reversible numbers in any Cipher Code, but in a direct manner on the A3 A3 Standard Rosicrucian Cipher Code, for it reveals 8.8, equal "ff," the double form for "ffrauncis" repeatedly shown, with the name, in Folio 1 of the Northumberland MSS.

Now "ffrauncis" equals III, the 3 Shibboleth pillars or Tripod of the Geometric Code in question, which gives harmonious interpretations of "Master Sp.," "Puttenham," and other surnames mentioned by Mr. Cuninghame.



It is by the Sub-Shibboleth of the Standard Code U (You), 22, and I 11, that 33 is obtained. "Julius," for instance, gives exactly 99, the total numerical value at the starting message of the three Shibboleth boundary lines of the Standard Code, viewed as a Tetrahedron; the sequential messages in perfect numerical order being 43 and 53, also to be multiplied by three. To show how responsive this Code is to Baconian tests I may mention that B A. and CON(E) are practically equivalent as 4.3 and 43; and in evident agreement with certain Rosicrucian emblem-relics in a niche above the Porch at Gorhambury ruins.

Yours faithfully, HENRY WOOLLEN.

West Ealing, W., December 3rd, 1913.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In 1609 Lord Delaware, Sir Thomas Gates, and Sir George Somers were appointed Governors of Virginia, and proceeded thither to assume their duties. On the way Somers was wrecked on the Bermudas, then called "The Isle of Devils." His ship was called the *Sea Venture*.

This was the wreck that is said to have suggested the play known as (Shakespeare's?) *Tempest*. The author of the play had evidently read Strachey's "True Repertory," and followed it in his descriptions of the "vexed Bermoothes": the cries of the mariners, the trembling star, flaming among the shrouds, which had appeared to the excited imagination of the weary and fasting Admiral (Somers) at the helm.

Strachey's words are as follows:

"On this strand at moonlight, the hag-born Caliban might roll and growl: Sycorax, the blue-eyed witch, might hover in the cloud wracks; and the voices of the winds whisper strange secrets."

Now here is the interesting thing to note—"the same historian Strachey wrote another book, 'The Historie of Travail into Virginia Brittania,' covering the years 1610, 1611, and 1612. Of this book he made two copies in his own handwriting, one of which, dedicated to Sir Francis Bacon, was deposited in the British Museum; the other, dedicated to Sir Allen Apsley, lieutenant of the Tower, and father of Lucy Hutchinson, was preserved among the Ashmolean manuscripts. There these two priceless manuscripts slept unnoticed more than 200 years! They were finally unearthed in 1849 by R. H. Major, of the British Museum, and printed for the Hakluyt Society."

The foregoing is copied from Mrs. Roger A. Pryor's book, "The Birth of a Nation," Grosset & Dunlop, publishers, New York, copyrighted by the McMillan Company in 1907. Is it conceivable that Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, could have seen Strachey's "True Repertory" of Admiral Sir George Somers' wreck on the

"vexed Bermoothes," and is not it a moral certainty that Sir Francis Bacon *did*? He could not have helped seeing it, situated as he was at the centre of the Government which sent Somers out. Moreover, the certainty that he *did* see Strachey's report is strengthened by the proved fact that Strachey's *next* book was dedicated to Bacon himself.

That no one happened to discover the fact of the dedication until 1849 does not weaken the case of a Baconian deduction at all.

We may assume that Bacon wrote to Strachey after reading his *first* book, "The True Repertory," and that Strachey, very naturally, would have dedicated his *second* book to the great statesman who had taken an interest in the first production.

Yours truly,

P. H. W. Ross.

New York.

## NOTES.

A CORRESPONDENT asks: "Can you tell me if 'speare' was pronounced as 'spēr' (e) in the 16th century? I believe it would be. This would be very significant in view of the lines in *The Tempest*:—

'The strong based promontory  
Have I made shake and by the spurs plucked up  
The pine and cedar.'

A strong based promontory is a *Beacon*, is it not?"

"A Bacon Lover" asks: "Is it generally known that the garden of Lincoln's Inn Fields owed its laying-out to Francis Bacon? The Commission was entrusted to Lord Verulam, Lord Chancellor, with Earl Worcester, Earl Pembroke, Earl Arundel, and others, according to plans of Inigo Jones, Surveyor-General of King's Works."

Lord Bacon has been claimed by a contributor to the *Eastern Daily Press* as "a great East Anglian," who writes:—

"This great man, though London born, must have spent much of his early life at his father's Suffolk home at Redgrave. Being of a delicate constitution, one would naturally suppose his parents would be inclined to bring him down from town to the restfulness of Redgrave Hall whenever they could. One may imagine him as a boy walking and riding in the park, enjoying the freshness of the air and the freedom from restraint and developing in bodily vigour by exercise out of doors. . . . Thus it came about that a quiet country seat in East Anglia sheltered a Lord Keeper, a Lord Chancellor, viz., the two Bacons, father and son, and one who had the offer of the latter office but declined, Lord Chief Justice Holt; and lovers of this eastern part of England may be excused a little pardonable pride in recalling this fact at this time."

---

It would appear that Shakespeare had read the Maxims of Publius Syrus, and it would be interesting to know when they were first translated into English. The following are amongst the parallelisms to be found between the two writers:—

"Unless degree is preserved, the first place is safe for none."

—Maxim 1,042.

"Take but degree away, untune that string  
And, hark what discord follows! Each thing meets  
In mere oppugnancy."—*Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii.

"When fortune flatters she does it to betray."—Maxim 278.

"When fortune means to men most good,  
She looks upon them with a threatening eye."

—*King John*, III. iv.

"It is better to learn late than never."—Maxim 864.

"An unlessoned girl, unschooled, unpractised;  
Happy in this, she is not yet so old  
But she may learn."—*Merchant of Venice*, III. ii.

"Familiarity breeds contempt."—Maxim 640.

"I hope upon familiarity will grow more contempt."

—*Merry Wives*, I. i.

---

There will appear in *The New Dramatic Mirror*, of

K



New York, in the issues of 1st and 8th of April, a series of questions put by Dr. Appleton Morgan on statements made and arguments advanced in "The Baconian Heresy," with Mr. J. M. Robertson's replies thereto.

---

A Bacon Society has been established in Sydney, N.S.W. Efforts are being made to form a similar Society in Chicago. During the last month enquiries have been received from Vienna as to the constitution and objects of the English Society, with a view to the establishment of a Society there.

---

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has during the past winter delivered a series of lectures with lantern slides, which have been attended by upwards of 5,000 people. These have been—October 18th at Fulham Town Hall; November 3rd at Lyndhurst Hall, Hampstead; November 17th at Ealing Victoria Hall; December 8th at the Public Hall, East Croydon; February 2nd at Wimbledon Baths; March 2nd at the Town Hall, Battersea; March 30th at King Edward's School, Finchley. On the 15th of April Sir Edwin will lecture at the Stanley Hall, Kentish Town.

---

Mr. W. T. Smedley addressed the members of the St. Albans and Herts Architectural and Archæological Society in the Museum, St. Albans, on November 10th on Francis Bacon, Canon G. H. P. Glossop presiding; Mr. H. Kendra Baker lectured at Saffron Walden in January on the Shakespeare Authorship, and Mr. R. L. Eagle addressed the Masters and Pupils of the Royal Masonic School at Watford on the 15th of March on the same subject.

---

Miss A. A. Leith draws attention to a passage in a letter dated December, 1577, written by John Sturm from his



school at Strasburg to Lord Burleigh. He writes: "A son of the Lord Keeper is with us, his good manners, modesty and conversation please me so much that I am sorry I cannot make use of him as his goodness deserves." Sturm adds: "He is named Edward." Edward Bacon, who was the youngest son of the Lord Keeper Bacon by his first wife, represented Yarmouth in the Parliaments summoned from 1576 to 1583. There is no evidence that Edward Bacon was abroad in 1577. Sturm's language does not appear to be such as he would use in speaking of a Member of Parliament, but it would be well suited to a youth of 16 or 17. Francis *was* abroad in 1577.

---

Messrs. Constable & Co. will publish in the course of the next two months a work by Mr. Edward George Harman, C.B., entitled, "Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon" (15/- net). The book is a critical examination of the poems of Edmund Spenser, as a result of which the writer concludes that the real author of these poems was Francis Bacon, and he claims to demonstrate that many of the books of the period, including the plays of Shakespeare, had the same origin, and that Bacon began authorship on the various impersonations as a boy. The book contains much new matter of great historical interest, emerging in the light of this theory, the most important being in the interpretations which the author gives of the principal characters in "The Faery Queen."

---

There are abundant signs that there is a quickening of interest in literary circles in France as to the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. Especially is this the case in Paris, where several enthusiastic supporters of the Baconian theory have been holding

*causeries*, at which the subject has been ventilated. Bacon's acknowledged works have probably attracted more attention in France than in any other country, if one may judge from the number of books which have been written there by way of criticism and appreciation.

---

The 353rd Anniversary of Bacon's birth was celebrated by the Members of the Society at the Trocadero on the evening of the 22nd of January, when Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence presided at a dinner which was largely attended. Mr. H. Kendra Baker proposed the toast of "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon." The Anniversary was also celebrated by the Members of the Lyceum Club on the preceding Monday, when Lady Boyle presided, and the speakers included Mr. Frederick Harrison.